

### **REMARKS**

This paper is responsive to the Office Action mailed February 4, 2005. The allowance of **claims 17, 19-22 and 33** and the recognition of allowable subject matter in **claims 31, 41 and 43** is noted with appreciation. Nevertheless, amendment, reexamination and reconsideration are respectfully requested.

#### **The Office Action**

In the Office Action mailed February 4, 2005:

**claims 17, 19-22 and 33** were allowed;

**claims 11, 12, 29, 34, 35, 39-41 and 43** were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite;

**claims 31, 41 and 43** were found to be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims;

**claims 11, 12, 34, 35 and 39** were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,191,352 to Schuplin ("Schuplin");

**claim 23** was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,323,215 to Berger ("Berger");

**claims 11, 12, 34, 35, 39 and 41** were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schuplin in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,003,735 to Havener ("Havener"); and

**claims 24, 25, 29, 30 and 32** were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Berger in view of U.S. Patent No. 2,942,314 to Debner, et al. ("Debner").

#### **The Claims Comply with 35 U.S.C. 112**

**Claims 11, 12, 29, 34, 35, 39-41 and 43** were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention.

With regard to **claim 11**, the Office Action asserts that the recitation that the second object flange is in spaced relation from said first object support flange does not read on the elected species of FIG. 8A. However, **claim 11** has been amended and no longer recites that the second object support flange is in spaced relation from said first object support flange.

**Claim 29** has been canceled.

**Claim 43** has been amended to recite -- longitudinal axis-- instead of "longitudinal axes" in two places.

For the foregoing reasons, **claim 11**, as well as **claims 12, 34, 35** and **39-41**, which depend therefrom, and **claim 43** comply with 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.

#### **The Claims are not Anticipated**

**Claims 11, 12, 34, 35** and **39** were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Schuplin. However, **claim 11** has been amended to recite a first protrusion depending from said first flange and extending toward said top side and a second protrusion depending from said second flange and extending toward said top side wherein said first and second flanges each have a length and wherein said first and second protrusions each extend along all of said length of their respective flange to releasably engage an associated sealing grid surface to resist disengagement of said elongated support body from the associated sealing grid.

It is respectfully submitted that the partially severed sections **22** of Schuplin do not extend along all of said length of their respective flange.

For at least the foregoing reason, **claim 11**, as well as **claims 12, 34, 35** and **39**, which depend therefrom, is not anticipated by Schuplin.

**Claim 23** was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Berger. However, **claim 23** has been amended to include subject matter from **claim 31** and **claim 29**, from which **claim 31** depended. **Claim 31** was found to include allowable subject matter. It is respectfully submitted that the amendments to **claim 23** incorporates sufficient subject matter from **claims 31** and **29** to render **claim 23** allowable.

#### **The Claims are not Obvious**

**Claims 11, 12, 34, 35, 39** and **41** were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schuplin in view of Havener. However, even if the flanges of Havener's wing nut are considered to be object support flanges, as explained above, **claim 11** has been amended to recite wherein said first and second protrusions each extend along all of said length of their respective flange. It is respectfully submitted that the disclosure of partially severed sections **22** or pointed barbs of Schuplin (column 2, line 39) does not disclose or suggest first and second protrusions each extending along

all of said length of their respective flange.

Furthermore, it is respectfully submitted that the disclosure of prongs or detents **22, 23** in Havener (column 2, line 58) does not cure the deficiencies of Schuplin. Any attempted modification of Schuplin or Havener to meet **claim 11** would eliminate such pointed sections, barbs, prongs or detents **22, 23**. But, no motivation can be found in either reference therefor.

For at least the foregoing reasons, **claim 11**, as well as **claims 12, 34, 35, 39** and **41**, which depend therefrom, is not anticipated and is not obvious in light of Schuplin and Havener taken alone, or in any combination.

**Claims 24, 25, 29, 30** and **32** were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Berger in view of Debner.

However, it is respectfully submitted that the double-ended cord holder of Debner is non-analogous art with respect to the claims of the present application. One concerned with making a sign or object hanger would not look to the art of cord holding or to devices to be used with electrical appliances so that the power supply cord may be neatly fastened around an appliance, such as a toaster, vacuum cleaner or flat iron, when the cord is not in use (column 1, lines 15-20).

Furthermore, even if Debner is considered to be analogous art, **claims 24** and **25** depend from **claim 23**, which, as explained above, has been amended to include allowable subject matter. **Claim 32** depends from **claim 25**. **Claims 29** and **30** have been canceled.

For at least the foregoing reasons, **claims 24, 25** and **32** are not anticipated and are not obvious in light of Berger and Debner taken alone or in any combination.

### **Reinstatement of Claims**

It is respectfully submitted that for the foregoing reasons, **claim 11** is in condition for allowance. The Restriction Requirement mailed April 9, 2003 indicated that **claims 11-13** were generic. It is respectfully submitted that **claims 11** and **12** remain generic. For example, it is respectfully submitted that **claim 11** reads on the species of FIGS. 1A-C, 5A-C and 6A-C. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that **claims 14-16, 36-38** and **42**, which depend from **claim 11**, be reinstated.

As explained above, it is respectfully submitted that **claim 23** has been amended to include allowable subject matter. Additionally, it is respectfully submitted that **claim 23** is generic and reads on the species of FIG. 1A-C, FIG. 5A-C and 6A-C. **Claims 26-**

28 depend from **claim 23**. Therefore, is respectfully requested that **claims 26-28** be reinstated.

### Telephone Interview

In the interests of advancing this application to issue the Applicant(s) respectfully request that the Examiner telephone the undersigned to discuss the foregoing or any suggestions that the Examiner may have to place the case in condition for allowance.

### CONCLUSION

**Claims 11, 12, 17, 19-25 and 32-43** remain in the application. **Claims 11, 23 and 43** have been amended. **Claims 29, 30 and 31** have been canceled. Reinstatement has been requested for **claims 14-16, 26-28, 36-38 and 42**. New **claims 44-46** have been added. For at least the foregoing reasons, the application is in condition for allowance. Early indication thereof is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

FAY, SHARPE, FAGAN,  
MINNICH & McKEE, LLP

29 Apr 2005  
Date

Jay F. Modovanyi  
Jay F. Modovanyi, Reg. No. 29,678  
Thomas Tillander, Reg. No. 47,334  
1100 Superior Avenue  
7<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-2579  
(216) 861-5582

### Certificate of Mailing

Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.8, I certify that this Amendment is being

- ☒ deposited with the United States Postal Service as First Class mail, addressed to: MAIL STOP AMENDMENT, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on the date indicated below.
- ☐ transmitted via facsimile in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.8 on the date indicated below.
- ☐ deposited with the United States Postal Service "Express Mail Post Office to Addressee" service under 37 C.F.R. 1.10 on the date indicated below and is addressed to: MAIL STOP AMENDMENT, Commissioner For Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

Express Mail Label No.:
Date <u>April 29, 2005</u>

Signature <u>Iris E Weber</u>
Printed Name Iris E Weber